

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated June 8, 2007, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 were rejected.

Claims 1, 18 and 24 are amended.

Summary of Interview

The undersigned representative thanks the Examiner for her time in conducting an interview on July 18, 2007. In accordance with MPEP §713.04, the relevant portions of the interview are summarized herein.

The rejection under 35 USC §103 over Holt in view of Gross was discussed. During the interview, proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 18 and 24 were discussed.

The arguments discussed during the interview are summarized below.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

In the 3rd and 4th paragraphs of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Holt et al., US 6,601,061 B1 in view of Gross et al., US Pub. 2004/0143569 A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 18 and 24 have been amended to recite elements similar to:

generating and storing in a memory of the client device a local index of a plurality of articles associated with at least one of a user or the client device, each article having an article type from a plurality of article types;
executing on the client device a search query on the local index to produce a first result set of articles relevant to the search query, the first result set referencing a plurality of articles having different types;
receiving on the client device from a remote search system a second result set from a search of a global index, the second result set relevant to the search query;
receiving, from the user, a selection of user-defined display parameters, including a selection of article types to be displayed;
generating on the client device **a user interface based on user selection of article types to be displayed**, the user interface including a combined display of the first result set and the second result set ; and
displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of the client device, wherein the **first and second result sets are segregated in the user interface.**

These elements allow the user to control the display of local and global search results through the selection of user-defined display parameters including the selection of article types to be displayed. A user-interface is generated based on the selection of article types to be displayed, thus filtering the result set from a local search of the client device based on the user selection of article types to be displayed. Displayed search results for global and local searches are segregated in the generated user interface.

To further assist the Examiner, during the interview FIG. 3 of the specification was discussed as one example embodiment that operated in accordance with the claimed method. FIG. 3 illustrates a generated graphic user interface 301 that includes local search results from searching Files 306, Email 304 and Chat messages 308 based on the user selection of article types to be displayed in a set of user-defined display parameters. Search results from a global search of the Web 302 and a local search of Files 306, Email 204 and Chat Messages 308, using the search term ‘flower’ are segregated in the generated user interface 301, for

example, showing the Files 306 on the left side and the Emails 205 on the right side of the user interface.

As discussed during the interview, neither Gross nor Holt discloses the claimed elements, alone or in combination. Holt is directed to the combination of search results from public and private web pages and fails to disclose a local search result. Gross is directed to a system for incremental searching as a user enters characters into search fields.

First, Gross fails to disclose elements that govern the filtering of search results or generation of a user-interface such as “user-defined display parameters, including article types to be displayed”. Gross does not appear to allow the user to select which article types to be displayed. Second, it further follows that Gross does not disclose “generating on the client device **a user interface based on user selection of article types to be displayed**”.

Third, Gross further fails to disclose “displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of the client device, wherein the **first and second result sets are segregated in the user interface**”. This failure to teach or disclose segregation of search results according to result set is made apparent, for example, in FIGS. 3A-3H of Gross. As explained to the Examiner, FIG. 3B of Gross, for example, shows only a single list of search results on the left side of the screen at 308B; the currently selected result is shown in detail at 310B on the right side. Thus Gross does not show first and second results at the same time in a segregated manner.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 18 and 24, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over Gross and Holt. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 depend from claims 1, 18 and 24. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 also recite elements not disclosed by the cited art.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
David Marmaros, et al.

Date: August 2, 2007

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (415) 281-1350